

first few weeks most girls are not very liable to become pregnant in any event, whether they use a method or not.

That Dr. Kisch should favour the condom leaves me quite cold, for his assertion that they are the most trustworthy of means is one of the points which my whole work tends to disprove. Of the Report of the Cambridge Birth Control Centre, on the other hand, I have certain criticisms it would take much space to set out. I am quite willing to believe that Mr. Gaskell is right that if a strong, thoroughly tested condom is used it may seldom result in failure, although I get many complaints from private people telling me of the failures they have experienced with expensive condoms. But the price of such a condom as Mr. Gaskell recommends is half-a-crown or so, hence quite beyond the reach of the really poor. I know Mr. Gaskell gives many away, but he can't give to *all*!

As regards Mr. Gaskell's last paragraph, I controvert everything he says. The use of the condom by the man is a physiological fraud on the woman he uses, depriving her of the benefits of true coitus, and placing her at his mercy. The fact that Mr. Gaskell talks of sex union as "a trouble" instead of, as it should be considered, the consummation of the *mutual rite*, shows that he misses the essential meaning of the marriage act.

Even "reliability" sinks to minor significance before this fact:—that there is and can be in the nature of things no male method which is not directly fraudulent to the woman, starving her of what her system needs, the prostatic secretions.

MARIE C. STOPES,

President, Society for Constructive  
Birth Control and Racial Progress,

108, Whitfield Street, London, W.1.

#### *To the Editor, Eugenics Review.*

SIR,—I find there is such a very widespread misconception about Dr. Marie Stopes's teaching

—may I say as one who has known her and her work intimately for some years that her idea is not to *stop* babies, but simply to *space* them properly, so that the mother may have time to recover, and that each child may be born strong and healthy and prevent us rapidly becoming a C<sub>3</sub> population, which has hitherto been a grave danger.

May I add that she has *assisted* several sterile mothers to produce offspring and that recently a mother rose in the audience after my speech and asked if she might show me the portrait of a simply magnificent baby who, she told me, "was entirely owing to Dr. Marie Stopes."

It is so unfortunate that any reformer's great work should be hindered by misrepresentation.

May I hope you will give this statement the publicity of your columns?

LAURA HENDERSON,

18, Rutland Gate, S.W.7.

#### **Marriage and Longevity**

##### *To the Editor, Eugenics Review.*

SIR,—Does not the marrying age of a people necessarily influence their longevity? If men did not marry until forty, practically all children born in wedlock would be the offspring of men who had reached forty without contracting serious disease. I don't remember any of your contributors pointing out the improving effect an increased marriage age is likely to have on our population. If our male unemployables could be induced to remain single until thirty, few would ever marry and beget other degenerates, as the unmarried unemployable has usually become rotten with venereal disease and drink by thirty and is beginning to crack up. At present the lowest elements of our population marry at the earliest age, and the dole and out-relief, of course, encourage it.

JOSEPH BANISTER,

9, Mill Lane, Hampstead, N.W.6.